1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

233 shearing is delayed until the warmer weather. Shearing, too,
236 marks the passing of the winter and is considered a festival.
461 On the final day there is meat, wine, and dancing. Like the journey from the plains it is also hard work for the shepherd, giving him, however, an opportunity to prove his expertise and strength. In a highly competitive atmosphere before the appraising eyes of each other and the women, the men of the stani gather in the sheep-fold to clip the fleeces of the different flocks. A strong and skilful man may shear sixty animals in a day.

233 The cycle of shepherding activities continues with the mating
461 season in June or July, the date depending on the condition of
[234] the animals. Then, in the last days of July, the cheese merchant closes his station and gradually with the reduced flow of milk from the pregnant ewes the shepherds milk their animals less frequently until, some time in the first half of August, lactation ceases. At length the shepherds pause and rest.

When the shepherds arrive in the mountains their mood changes almost abruptly from an expectation of the worst to guarded optimism. Since the autumn they have suffered anxiety, crisis, and frequently physical exhaustion in their efforts to avoid disaster to the lambs, a small milk yield, or disease. These dangers do not exist, or are less considerable, in
[578] the summer. At this season the systematic practice of reciprocal grass theft, the sometimes accidental trespass, the intermingling of two flocks when they converge on the cheese-maker's station at milking time, are all situations which may precipitate quarrels with unrelated shepherds that threaten life and honour, but they are not possibilities that cause the shepherd much apprehensive concern. In personal oppositions he is confident in his own strength and courage, he depends on nothing outside himself. On the other hand, whatever skill a shepherd may possess, the dangers which threaten the flock in winter often depend on factors or elements beyond his individual control.
[235] Yet extreme poverty, which is a possible consequence of such a disaster, destroys honour and sometimes takes the lives of small children.

233 The Sarakatsan shepherd identifies himself with his animals.
825 Their condition is almost as personal a concern as his own
[572] health and appearance. If a sheep is stoned by another man, the shepherd's honour is touched.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

596 with the competitive values. On the other hand, two factors
577 have been noted which tend to hinder the young shepherd
554 from attaining the status of head of household as soon as might otherwise be the case. First, an eldest son must show respect to his father and accept his leadership as long as he is physically active and capable; or until the son is about thirty years of age. This is another way of saying that normally an eldest son cannot take a wife and expect to be in charge of family affairs until he is about thirty years of age. Secondly, brothers, although married, must remain as a united extended family until their sisters are safely married. This, of course, reflects the original unity of the sibling group. Thus, so far as respect and obedience towards an active father, or the unity of the sibling group (which are both important values of the kinship system), delay the young shepherd from assuming the role of a head of household, the kinship system and the competitive values of the community are in some measure of conflict.

4. THE 'COMPANY' OF RELATED FAMILIES

474 It is some consolation to brothers who may feel a genuine
233 distress at the necessary development of their relationship, if after the dissolution of the extended family they continue to
[594] manage their sheep together in a 'company'. It is also a practical convenience since the elementary family is not, normally, the sheep management unit in the winter unless it happens to possess at least 200 sheep and the services of four active shepherds. As we have seen in chapter two, the Sarakatsani prefer, in winter, to divide their sheep and goats into a number of different flocks. Where grassland is natural and scarce, the advantage of this division is that the optimum use is made of
[427] the pasture offered by any particular stretch of country. The lower limit of 200 sheep follows from the difficulty of renting
[558] very small areas of grazing from village communities. Also it is damaging to the pride of a shepherd if he is seen standing on watch over a flock of only forty or fifty 'zigouria', 'sterpha', or
[464] 'galaria'. Nevertheless, if poorer families with less than a hun-
[235] dred animals are unable to find or persuade kinsmen to accept them into their 'company', they are forced to work during the winter as wage shepherds for villagers, or occasionally for richer Sarakatsani, a situation which emphasizes their poverty and suggests the inadequacy of their kindred.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

suggests the inadequacy of their kindreds. Six of the forty-two households at Neochori find themselves in this position.

The requirements of a particular system of sheep management, then, often result in the association of two or more elementary or extended families in a 'company'. However, to explain the size and constitution of a particular 'company' it may be necessary to consider other factors as well. One of these is the difficulty of finding winter grazing. Where a tselingas owns or controls, by whatever means, grazing land in excess of the requirements of his own family, he almost inevitably leads a 'company' of kinsmen whose number is determined simply by the size of their flocks and the carrying capacity of his land.

Another factor is security. One of the larger 'stanis' in Thesprotia represents the interests of eighty persons with two thousand head of sheep and goats. They occupy a continuous tract of grazing land but although the different families are now individually entitled to their occupancy they still prefer to manage their affairs together in what represents, in fact, a confederation of three 'companies'. The stani had originally arrived in the area in the winter of 1944–5 after the Muslim landowners had fled to Albania, an exodus which left considerable areas of grassland untenanted. The Christian villagers of the district who claimed the abandoned lands strongly resented this immigration of shepherds while the final distribution of the land was still in doubt. Yet they were impressed by the strength and armament of the group and were not unpleased, at a time when food was short, to barter the grazing land for quantities of cheese in the first winter and olive oil in the second. However, difficulties soon arose between the two groups. After the Sarakatsani had refused to sell a proportion of their own lambs to replace the village flocks which had been destroyed or stolen in the war, they were peremptorily ordered, in January 1946 at the height of the lambing, to leave the village boundaries; an ultimatum which the villagers must have known they would refuse. Shortly afterwards a desperate attempt to burn down the Sarakatsan huts was also unsuccessful. In the six years which followed these incidents, 1947–53, the Muslim lands were administered by the Ministry of Finance and the Sarakatsani continued to graze them in relative peace. But in 1954 the land used by the stani became village common land and without village citizenship the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Zagori, he decided to pay a visit to his 'cousin' John, a Sarakatsanos of wealth and influence. He was confident that John could help him through his influence over the local Member of Parliament. 'He has him in his pocket' (τὸν ἔχει στὴ τσέπη του), he explained. John and Sotiri are third cousins. This otherwise tenuous and formally unrecognized kinship link is 'drawn in' to provide a basis of mutual trust in a relationship which is clearly one of patronage. John, for his part, does not resent the importunate requests of his distant relatives. The ability to bestow patronage is its own reward, for it increases his prestige not only in the community of Sarakatsani but with such personalities as parliamentary candidates who compete for the votes which they believe he commands.

A man's 'effective kindred' may also be considerably more restricted than the conventional limits allow. This happens when a family possesses so little prestige that kinsmen would rather not have any unnecessary association with its members. A case in point is the family of Pistiolis at Skamneli which is desperately poor and although morally upright is almost socially outcast. The genealogical information which the father was able to provide was meagre. He did not even know where most of his first cousins were living, and of second cousins he could name only a few. Over a long period of years he had received very few invitations to the weddings of kinsmen, and although he travelled considerably, earning a pittance by carrying goods on his two pack mules, he was too ashamed to ask for hospitality at a kinsman's home in the places where he knew them to be living; consequently he always slept in the open, a circumstance which encouraged mocking remarks about his shaggy and uncouth appearance.

But besides the flexibility in the range of obligations to collateral kinsmen there are also situations which may lead to their complete abrogation. Trust and mutual confidence is the basis of kin relationship. Quarrels which question these qualities are rare, but where they do occur they are far more serious than the differences which are expected to arise between unrelated men. In the latter instance normal social relations may be resumed after a long period of estrangement, but in the former case, especially where one kinsman has publicly insulted another, confidence is permanently destroyed. The proverb,

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Even in the most favourable circumstances loss of honour is unlikely to be entirely remedied within the living memory of those who know of the affair. A man whose family has lost its honour cannot in any real sense be said to possess prestige at all. People say of a man who has allowed his father's slayer to remain undisturbed in the same neighbourhood, 'We don't even say "good morning" to him'. In fact this is not true. People do greet him, but formally and without enthusiasm. He is occasionally seen in the coffee-shop, but he sits in a corner and little attention is paid to him. He is tolerated but his prestige is negative. Loss of honour does not mean direct social ostracism. The sanction is more subtle; it implies the withdrawal of full recognition or response.

Although honour is an essential prerequisite of prestige it is not itself entirely independent of it. Families which on quite different grounds, such as poverty, have no prestige and are classed generally as 'lost' families (χαμένες οἰκογένειες), are denied the imputation of honour even though no positive accusation of dishonour can be pointed against them. Quite small incidents, which are not in themselves exactly questions of honour, are seized upon by the community to show prospectively that such a family, if it were faced by the duty of defending its honour, would be found wanting. The family of Costas Pistiolis is very poor. In the Sarakatsan view there must always be something morally wrong with a very poor man, and given their system of values this is not difficult to understand. A poor man is dependent on others for employment, or favours, if his family is to survive. He is not in a position to insist upon an equality in honour which, in any case, the community will not allow him. One day I saw a youth pelting the little son of Costas with pieces of dung in his father's presence. Costas, however, could do nothing since the youth's father was an influential member of the co-operating group which only tolerated with difficulty the presence of the Pistiolis family among its number. Another witness of the little scene swore and told me that you could copulate with this man's daughter and he would stand by and hold your coat.

Any attack made on the family's honour demands an immediate response. Failure to respond fatally damages the prestige of the outraged group and all its members. Without

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

or hut. It is, nevertheless, true that people are insatiably curious about the details of domestic life and relations in other families. The condemnation of eavesdropping, although ideally it points to the recognition of the right of family privacy, in practice merely places a negative sanction on one particularly blatant method of obtaining information about other people's affairs.

Men are not honourable who, possessing great physical strength, use it to tyrannize others. They are men who without cause or restraint attack others with insults, using their mothers' or sisters' names in offensive sexual contexts or uttering other provocative blasphemics. Such a man, it is believed, purposely stages an incident to humiliate another who must either lose honour by not responding, or suffer a physical beating. It is accepted that, in most instances, to insult another is neither avoidable nor dishonourable. A sheep strays across a boundary, another shepherd stones it, its owner insults him, blows are exchanged. This sequence of events is to be expected in a community where the interests of different families conflict and each man must maintain his self-regard and the honour of the family. But wanton and unprovoked outrage is evil.

There are, also, categories of persons whom it is always dishonourable for a man to assault: women, old men, young boys, and children, persons weaker than himself. A man who interferes with women, or picks a quarrel with an old man or a young boy, quickly loses his social reputation. It sometimes occurs that, when grazing land is disputed, a family will send its sheep under the guard of a young shepherd boy into the disputed area, knowing that the other shepherd will not improve his case with the community, the villagers, or the police, if he strikes the youth. However, this is a dangerous tactic since, if the young shepherd is struck, honour demands retaliation.

There is one other category of persons that a man must not exploit, the very poor. Whereas a Sarakatsanos will not hesitate to trick or deceive other men, it is not honourable to take advantage of a very poor man with only twenty or thirty animals, particularly if he has a young family. It is the very fact of his dependence on the generosity and forbearance of those of greater power and prestige that morally prevents them from exploiting him. In the face of the implicit admission of his failure in life they cannot press home their advantage. Since

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

he has failed to provide adequately for his children, others must assume a responsibility not to make their humiliating condition worse. If men oppress the very poor of their own community, there is an element of hubris in their conduct that respects neither God nor the family which is His institution.

In general, where the interests and honour of a family are not affected, every effort ought to be made to avoid giving needless affronts to others. When people pass in hailing distance, conventional greetings must be carefully exchanged. When he is asked for some information which he does not wish to give, or when he is requested to do something which he does not wish to do, a man ought not to reply with a curt negative; rather he should answer in the one case with polite and elaborate evasions, and in the other with a declaration of his willingness to help, balanced by a list of insurmountable difficulties which, nevertheless, he will struggle to overcome. Within the limit of his pride a man ought always to appear sociable and concerned. These prescriptions are not entirely prudential. There is a consciousness of common humanity. Competitive hostilities prevent men from expressing this feeling except in the marginal areas of social life; but to ignore it entirely is not only socially dangerous, but it denies the essential nobility and generosity of man and provokes the anger of God.

The community, then, places certain bounds on the expression of hostility. They are not very onerous limitations, but clearly there may often exist doubt, in the evaluation of a man's conduct, as to whether he has overstepped the limit of permissible hostility and, thus, has lost his reputation for acting as an honourable man. Inevitably the duty to further family interests, and the limitation on the expression of hostility, conflict in certain circumstances.

Ideally, it is maintained, a man ought to go beyond the negative prescriptions contained in the notion of the honourable man; he ought also to be positively concerned about the interests and honour of an unrelated man, he ought to be φιλότιμος, caring for, or loving, his honour. That is to say he ought to be so intensely concerned about the nobility of his own conduct that he takes into account how his actions affect the honour and prestige of others. It is still an essentially self-regarding attitude, but the acute concern about the purity of

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

554 and fearful that he may leave his dependants without a pro-
577 tector. But although the predicament of a man in this position is
596 appreciated by other Sarakatsani, it scarcely mitigates the loss of prestige. If a man has no adult son to protect his daughter's virtue, the fault is his. For weakness is despised. In itself it tends to diminish the prestige of a family even before it has led to dishonour. And men who are isolated without brothers or [156] sons are noticeably less proud, less confident, and in some cases are, by Sarakatsan standards, pathetically diffident and nervous—overt personality traits which I have not observed in men born into large sibling groups with a number of brothers.

(B) WEALTH

59
554
556 Τὰ βιό is the property owned by a family, particularly its flocks of sheep and goats, the mules and horses. Although money invested in other objects of prestige such as village houses is important, animals in a pastoral community are the significant form of wealth and a critical element in social reputation.

Today there are few families that own more than five hundred
● [235] sheep and goats. A household with more than 150 animals holds a respectable position in the community, one with 80 to 120 animals is on the brink of poverty, while a group with less than 40 animals is despicably poor. Yet the question of wealth is not quite so simple as this arithmetical scale might suggest. The Myriounis extended family of five brothers have 476 animals. Only the flocks of two other families in the Neochori local group exceed theirs in size. So long as they remain a single family with this large flock and five adult men to serve and protect it, the family is clearly, in this respect, a group of high prestige among the Neochori shepherds and indeed in the total community. But when the family is forced to divide into a group of autonomous families, each brother will possess only 80–90 sheep and goats; it may, therefore, seem that at a single stroke they will fall from one end of the wealth-prestige scale to the other. In fact, however, so long as the families of a group of brothers hold together in a co-operative association, folding their sheep together in a single flock (although with different ear-signs), they continue to derive some prestige from the aggregate number of their animals. Still it will now be said, for instance, that Theodoros has only 80 sheep and goats of his

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

own, but four children to provide for. As soon as people begin to calculate in this manner, the inadequacy of his personal wealth emerges, and to some extent his prestige falls. Men with no brothers who are forced to join the 'company' of a cousin or an affine gain some prestige and cover from the size of the co-operating group of which they form a part, but the size of their own flock is always very precisely appreciated by outsiders. The worst situation is that of the family head with only a few animals who is forced to become a wage shepherd to an unrelated man, since in this case poverty associated with dependence on a stranger destroys prestige.

Taken together, numbers and wealth are the necessary material foundation for high family prestige. They imply the independence of the family within the community, both economically in the sense that the group is viable (and possibly free of debt), and technically in that it has enough manpower to manage its flocks unaided. It suggests that the family will possess powerful patrons outside the community and that in the competition for winter pastures it will be in a better position to rent grazing land. A village generally prefers to let an area of reasonable size, and to negotiate with a prosperous group able to provide a steady and profitable flow of bribes and presents.

Also, it is the family of wealth and numbers, with powerful patrons and sufficient winter grazing, that draws to itself a number of less fortunate kinsmen. The dependence and support of these men make the protecting family the nucleus of a co-operative association, extending yet further its strength, influence, and prestige. It attracts many passing visits from other kinsmen. Men do not often visit kinsmen of low prestige, since such association only draws attention to a relationship which is best forgotten: on the other hand, they take every opportunity to pay a call on a kinsman of position and repute, to cultivate a relationship that is a source of possible support in future misfortune and, of itself, brings a measure of vicarious prestige.

Men like Pistiolis, who are at the lowest level of the community hierarchy of prestige, seldom receive a visitor from one year's end to another. Indeed, the number of visitors that a family receives is generally a reliable index of its reputation. It is

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

particularist. They have a moral content of their own but they cannot be referred to any universal moral principle.

For the Sarakatsani, family honour is the chief concern. Indeed, the honour of community or nation is, in their view, a projection of the concept of family honour. This honour is shared in two senses; intensively, by those whose reputation is identified by their membership in the same family; extensively, by the community of families sharing in common a system of values by which they judge one another's position and performance. Honour depends not upon the consciences of the individuals in a family whose reputation is under scrutiny, but on the concessions and reluctant approval of other families. Most of these are unrelated and hostile. Since the threat of denigration is continuous, it must be balanced by the repeated exhibition of those qualities that support honour and prestige: self-assertive courage in men, modest virtue in women. In the one case by social convention, in the other by its negative character, the presence of these qualities is more often revealed by attitudes and appearances than substantive proof. There is an emphasis on opinions and appearances, not facts. The consequences of action rather than the intentions behind it are important. This does not mean that private shame for undiscovered failure does not exist. But, inevitably, ideas about individual moral responsibility are blurred, and undiscovered shame is not as morally serious as public disgrace.

Reputation is impossible without strength. Poverty is a [735] mark of failure, not a virtue. Strength in sheep and in men encourages others to respect a family's honour, it attracts dependent kinsmen whose support further extends influence and prestige. Honour and strength are linked. If a family is without sons the call of honour may find a man in the dilemma that if honour is lost the moral existence of the family collapses, or if honour is vindicated his family becomes a leaderless group of women and children dependent on the generosity of kinsmen, a condition which must eventually affect prestige and, perhaps, honour as well. Honour, and the obligation to die for it, is the ideal value, but the sacrifice necessarily weakens the family. Honour remains integral, but becomes more vulnerable. A family needs at least one man in the role of unmarried brother whose unreflecting courage guards its

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

182 577 771 refraction of Orthodox dogma and practice, yet the value of the Christian ideal of the fellowship of all men in Christ, with the universalistic ethical values that follow from it, is not to be avoided. How is this opposition of values resolved or accommodated?

182 577 771 602 There is no great problem of fellowship between Sarakatsani who are related by kinship or marriage. By associating The Father, The Son, and the Mother of God in a Holy archetype Family, the institutions and relationships of the Sarakatsan family, even the concept of honour and the duty to defend it, are given a categorical quality and a divine sanction; and by extension kindred and affinal bonds receive a similar validation. It is true that even within this restricted circle certain Christian values cannot enjoy a general application. Modesty, meekness, humility are values only admirable in women. Some Christian prescriptions have to be entirely set aside. One cannot forgive a kinsman who has betrayed his trust, at least not until he is dead. And one avoids the company of a kinsman [735] who is despised for his poverty; the poor are not blessed. Yet love (ἀγάπη), mutual trust, truth, and altruism are important Christian virtues which are the ideal values of family and kinship life. Men would extend the circle of their application if they could, but the conditions of life in a fallen world prevent this, particularly limited resources, the divinely sanctioned honour and interests of a man's own family, the condition of envy.

182 577 771 783 828 Yet in their commitment to the concept of honour as the guiding principle of behaviour, the Sarakatsani cannot admit themselves to be anything but noble; and this must be said not only of the soul but the body also, for honour is related to physical strength and manliness when this is disciplined and spiritualized. The original guilt for sin must be placed elsewhere. This is the role of the Devil. Sensuality was the sin of Adam but only after the sin had been thought of and presented to him by the Devil with the assistance of woman. Envy, the more fundamental sin, was originally the cause of the Devil's rebellion against God. 'The Devil envied God' (ὁ διάβολος ζήλεψε τὸν Θεό), the Sarakatsani say. In this way the Sarakatsani avoid personal guilt for their own implication in these sins. Even in the case of personal sins for which individual